

Appl. No. 09/429,226
Amtd. dated June 21, 2004
Reply to Office action of March 22, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants received the Office Action dated March 22, 2004, in which the Examiner: (1) objected to claims 2, 4, 7-8, 15, 19 and 21 because of informalities; (2) objected to claims 3, 12 and 13 as being dependent on a rejected base claims, but otherwise allowable; (3) rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; (4) rejected claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 14-16 and 20-23 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,240,511 ("Blumenau"); (5) rejected claims 4, 6, 17-18 and 24 as being obvious in view of Blumenau and U.S. Patent No. 5,974,254 ("Hsu"); (6) rejected claims 9 and 10 as obvious in view of Blumenau and U.S. Patent No. 5,758,071 ("Burgess"); and (7) rejected claim 11 as obvious in view of Blumenau, Burgess and Hsu.

In this Response, Applicants amend claims 1-2, 4, 6-9 and 13-24. Also, Applicants cancel claims 3 and 12. Based on the amendments and arguments contained herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

I. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 2, 4, 7-8, 15, 19 and 21 have been amended to ensure proper antecedent basis. The scope of claims 2, 4, 7-8, 15, 19 and 21 has not changed.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected claim 19 as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 19 has been amended to clarify the meaning of "any data in the computer system" as supported in Applicants' specification, at least, on pages 7-8.

Claim 1 was amended to include the limitation of canceled claim 3. Amended claim 1, in part, requires that "the base configuration data is captured and stored more than once before current configuration data is captured." The Examiner indicated that claim 3 is allowable in independent form (see Office Action page 3, item "8"). For at least this reason, Applicants submit that claim 1 and all claims that depend from claim 1 are allowable.

Claim 9 was amended to include the limitation of canceled claim 12. Amended claim 9, in part, requires that "multiple sets of configuration data are

124405.01/1662.18100

Page 6 of 8

BEST AVAILABLE COPY
HP PDNO 200304287-1

Appl. No. 09/429,226
Amdt. dated June 21, 2004
Reply to Office action of March 22, 2004

captured and compared to each other and the base configuration." The Examiner indicated that claim 12 is allowable in independent form. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that claim 9 and all claims that depend from claim 9 are allowable.

Amended claim 14, in part, requires that "the program captures multiple base sets of configuration data, and later captures a current set of configuration data for comparison to the base sets of configuration data, the comparison used to service the computer." As recognized by the Examiner, with respect to claims 3 and 12, none of the references teaches or suggests a program that "captures multiple base sets of configuration data, and later captures a current set of configuration data for comparison to the base sets of configuration data" as required in claim 14. For at least this reason, Applicants submits that claim 14 and all claims that depend from claim 14 are allowable.

Amended claim 20, in part, requires that "the base configuration data comprises data captured during multiple time intervals before the current configuration data is captured." As recognized by the Examiner, with respect to claims 3 and 12, none of the references teaches or suggests that "the base configuration data comprises data captured during multiple time intervals before the current configuration data is captured" as required in claim 20. For at least this reason, Applicants submit that claim 20 and all claims that depend from claim 20 are allowable.

III. CONCLUSIONS

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appl. No. 09/429,226
Amdt. dated June 21, 2004
Reply to Office action of March 22, 2004

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any fees or time extensions are inadvertently omitted or if any fees have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Hewlett-Packard Company Deposit Account Number 08-2025 and enter any time extension(s) necessary to prevent this case from being abandoned.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan D. Christenson
PTO Reg. No. 54,036
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

BEST AVAILABLE COPY